

NOV 19 1923

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the act of Congress of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XVII, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1923

WHOLE NO. 456

## "The New Program for Latin"

This new and helpful pamphlet outlining ideas and ideals in the teaching of Secondary Latin will be sent you without charge.

A suggested course adapted to the present-day discussion as outlined in this program includes --

**SCOTT'S FIRST LATIN LESSONS (First Year)**

**SCOTT-SANFORD'S JUNIOR LATIN READER (Second Year)**

**SCOTT-SANFORD-BEESON'S THIRD LATIN BOOK (Third Year)**

Descriptive folder on request.

**SCOTT, FORESMAN AND COMPANY**

Publishers of the LAKE Latin Series

Chicago

Atlanta

New York

## Reasons for the Great Success of Place's Second Year Latin

THE "Introductory Lessons" and the "Training Camp" pave the way to Caesar's Gallic War. The "Introductory Lessons" lay stress on the syntactical principles not covered in First Year Latin, which need to be known for the intelligent reading of Caesar. Each lesson ends with an easy Latin story.

The "Training Camp" is an intensive study of the first twenty chapters of the "Gallic War"—each treated by itself with a preliminary review, a special vocabulary study, and a summary of grammatical principles.

The text consists of the most significant parts of the first seven books of "The Gallic War".

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

New York

Cincinnati

Chicago

Boston

Atlanta

### *The Enthusiasm of Experience*

"The development of the Latin forms and Latin syntax has been handled from the beginning to the end of the book with an almost intuitive understanding of the needs and abilities of young pupils".

"It is masterfully clear, logical, and thorough in its arrangement".

"The presentation of subjects is orderly, the sentences for translation well chosen, the longer reading lessons interesting".

"The material for reading, both in character and amount, is the best I have seen".

"Eminently fitted to the needs of beginners".

*A few extracts from hundreds of letters  
received by the publishers of*

**Collar and Daniell: First Year Latin**  
Revised by Thornton Jenkins

70 Fifth Ave.

GINN AND COMPANY

New York

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVII, No. 6

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 12, 1923

WHOLE NO. 456

## THE AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

The classicists of the United States are relatively well organized. Our colleagues in other branches of learning recognize it, our enemies admit it. The American Classical League has been attracting more and more attention, and deserves credit for having already done much for the cause of Greek and Latin instruction in School and College curricula. In all this, it has, of course, been building upon foundations that had been already laid by the great regional Classical Associations (The Classical Associations of the Middle West and South, of New England, and of the Atlantic States), and on the many local Classical Clubs or Leagues, such as those in New York, Philadelphia, Washington, Boston, Chicago, etc. An association that is largely concerned with propaganda, if it accomplishes anything at all, is sure to enjoy a 'high degree of visibility'. On the other hand, those that merely further scholarship are bound to be less in the public eye. At the opening of the School year it is, therefore, not unreasonable, to say the least, to call attention to the importance of our oldest organization, the American Philological Association, and to urge all those that are capable of any altruistic interest in a cause or are at all perceptive of what the work of others means to themselves to join it, if they are not yet members, to further its activities, if they are. It is, indeed, a considerable reflection upon the quality of a young doctor's devotion to learning and research, if he is unwilling to play some part with his fellows in increasing the influence of such a society as the American Philological Association. During over half a century of existence it has been a constant stimulus to classical studies, and the list of scholars who have held its offices from the term of the first President, William Dwight Whitney, down to that of our present distinguished chief, Edward Kennard Rand, or have presented papers at its meetings, includes most of the men who have 'done things' in the field of classical philology in America. Some have pushed out the boundaries of knowledge further and further by reading at the annual meetings and later publishing learned papers, the product of long and careful research, some have improved the pedagogy of our subject, putting forth text-books, the scholarly and practical qualities of which have received world-wide recognition, some have organized and officered local associations that have kept alive the learning and fellowship of their members, some have travelled far and wide, fostering by public lectures an interest in our subject among young and old whose ignorance, indifference, or hostility needed to be overcome, some have done several or all of these things. There has certainly been no shirker, no selfish recluse, no merely destructive critic

prominent in that list. Above all, the Association has done much to give the young scholar his start in legitimate publicity. The annual meetings assemble many who, having the business of making School and College appointments, must appraise intellectually and socially teachers who are beginning their careers or looking for advancement. At the meetings, also, friendships are formed not only of profit but of lasting pleasure. The criticism of the papers read is a reward for present achievement, a goad to better work. Scholars in isolated positions especially appreciate their opportunities for the interchange of thoughts. The mere sojourn for a few days in a new intellectual center is inspiring. The enjoyment of its hospitality, of its art or its other treasures, of companionship with persons of distinction outside our chosen field leaves a permanent memory of delight. Those who cannot afford to go regularly to the annual meetings can attend such at least as are held in their near neighborhood. The Transactions and Proceedings of the Association indicate the direction of scholarly activity among their fellows from year to year. The presence of their own names in the list of members is a visible sign to all who are seeking knowledge about them that they are prosperous and generous enough to contribute their annual mite to the treasury, that they sense their dependence upon fellow-workers all over the country, and have at any rate the will to bear a hand in bettering scholarship. In truth, the humblest instructor in the smallest School who is teaching the Classics is in debt to the American Philological Association, for some of its members are certain to have helped him to his own learning, provided him with his text-books, or fostered the study of Greek and Latin in his region of the country. His debt can be partially discharged if he himself assumes membership under proper sponsorship in our national society of almost a thousand scholars. To stay out is no credit to any man; to come in is a help to everybody who has at heart the fostering of classical learning.

WALTON BROOKS McDANIEL

## TRANSFER AND AUTOMATIC TRANSFER

Educationalists who have put themselves on record against the doctrine of transfer of training, finding this position no longer tenable and being unwilling to admit their error, are now falling back upon the claim that there is, at any rate, no such thing as 'automatic' transfer.

But this position is quite as untenable as the other. Hear what a psychologist<sup>1</sup> has to say on the subject:

<sup>1</sup>G. M. Stratton, *Developing Mental Power*, 16. For fuller presentation of Professor Stratton's views on transfer see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.202-203.

... If a person practice with the right hand the tossing and catching of balls, keeping two in the air at once, until he has attained a high degree of skill, will the effect of the practice be confined to the right hand? No. It will appear also in the left hand; it may be as though fully two-thirds of the practice had in some way been transferred to the hand that has not been practiced at all.

This is a very clear and convincing case. The right hand only is trained; but the effect of that practice appears in the skill automatically imparted to the left hand, which has had no training at all. A single experiment of this sort settles once and for all the question of the possibility of automatic transfer.

The constant appeal of the educationalist to psychology thus far has been—for him, as for others—singularly unfortunate in its results. Quite aside from the tendency just illustrated to leap to conclusions not at all warranted by the facts revealed by psychological study, it befogs the whole issue to attempt to carry on an educational discussion in terms of a science with which the educationalist himself may be none too familiar, and about which most of his hearers know nothing at all.

It may fairly be queried whether, in the discussion now agitating teachers of the Classics, the term 'automatic transfer' is used strictly in the sense intended by psychologists. If it is, those are reckoning without their host who cite psychology as proving that there is no such thing as automatic transfer.

The actual issue can be presented in the simplest terms; and practical decision can be reached, without appealing either to psychological experiments or to educational tests.

All now admit the possibility of transfer. The question is whether training in one field will *spontaneously* show helpful reactions in other fields, or whether there will be no such reactions *unless they are consciously worked for*.

Any teacher can settle this question for himself on the basis of his own experience and observation.

(1) If a child is trained by his parents to be truthful, self-reliant, and high minded, may these qualities carry over like second nature into fields he later may enter, or will he *inevitably* prove recreant in these fields, unless new pressure is consciously applied at every departure? It is absurd even to ask such a question as this.

(2) What shall we say of the Seventh-Grade beginner who runs to his teacher with the remark, 'Oh, I shall always know how to spell *nautical* now, because I know *nauta*'? Here is something that occurred spontaneously to the child; his teacher did not make the connection for him, nor did he himself work to secure it. This sort of thing is happening all the time with older students who are not so outspoken and so ingenuous.

Let no one, therefore, attempt to mislead Latin teachers by telling them that these transfers cannot be made, unless they are definitely worked for. It is not true. Still less let him claim the support of psychology for anything so palpably false.

It is instructive, in this connection, to think of the Latin classes of twenty or more years ago. In view of the preparation that all the entrants had in the Classics, some Colleges then did not feel it necessary to set an entrance examination in English. And who would deny that such students found it 'easier to take up French' than is the case now with people who know no Latin? And yet this was the very period in the teaching of Latin when practically no attention was paid to securing transfer.

For many reasons, which it is not necessary to recount here, the Latin situation is much changed in the Schools; and the average student doubtless learns less Latin and profits by fewer by-products. The question of the hour then is, How best shall we improve this situation?

Two ways are proposed: We are bidden (1) to try to bring the teaching of Latin back to something like its old efficiency, concentrating upon the problem of inculcating a mastery of the language, and devoting such time as is available to the conscious cultivation of the by-products that are already naturally accruing; (2) Frankly to give up any serious effort to retrieve the situation so far as mastery of Latin is concerned, and to devote the time thus saved to the conscious cultivation of by-products. In connection with (2) it may be argued that mastery of Latin will still be attained, though the time is devoted to other things. But this sounds very much like eating your cake and having it too. In a special School, and under exceptional conditions, some such miracle might be achieved. But in the average School, and under average conditions, the two-year Latin course, with such a program, could hardly fail to drop to the level of a course in applied 'Latin', where the vocabulary and the structure of the language are made to serve merely as a basis for other kinds of training.

If the times are really so bad that fears are entertained that the Schools will tolerate nothing better than this kind of 'Latin', let us face the issue frankly, not glossing over with fine flowing words, or attempting to justify, falsely, on psychological grounds a course which really is dictated by short-sighted expediency.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

#### LATIN AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN THE SCHOOLS OF THE LARGER CITIES OF OHIO FOR 1921-1922 AS COMPARED WITH 1920-1921<sup>1</sup>

This report is based on returns from seven of the eight cities of Ohio which have more than 85,000 in-

<sup>1</sup>A striking illustration of the large transfer to the study and mastery of Spanish from Latin conventionally learned is recorded in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY, 15-174.

<sup>2</sup>This statement was issued under date of May 15, 1922, as a companion to the copy of The Latin News and Notes of Ohio University, Athens, Ohio, for that date. The Report itself was unsigned, but the copy of the News Letter bore the signature of Victor D. Hill, Professor of Latin at that University. In the News Letter, Professor Hill wrote, among other things, as follows: "The importance of the comparison given <in the Report> lies in the concrete demonstration of the need for a larger number of young people to prepare themselves for the teaching of Latin. Since there are more pupils studying Latin in the High Schools than are studying all modern foreign languages taken together, it is evident

habitants. Akron was not included in the investigation because of information that a change in requirements had invalidated any figures that might be obtained from that city. The returns are surprisingly complete, as they include all the High Schools that are not definitely Technical or Junior High Schools, and number eighty-five per cent of the total when Technical and Junior High Schools are counted.

In contrast with the situation in some cities outside of Ohio, not one of the Technical Schools which reported offers any Latin. Most of them apparently offer Modern Foreign Languages, although the reports are not all complete in that particular. Since these Schools do not offer Latin, their enrollment is not counted in comparing the percentage gain in Latin with the percentage gain in total enrollment, although the fact that some of them have courses in Modern Foreign Languages must be taken into consideration with that part of the report which compares Latin and Modern Foreign Languages. 34.8 % of the total enrollment of the non-technical Schools reported are studying Latin this year.

Gain in total enrollment  $10\frac{1}{2}\%$   
Gain in Latin  $16\%$  *Net gain in Latin  $5\frac{1}{2}\%$*   
Gain in Modern Foreign Languages  $4\frac{1}{4}\%$   
Net loss in Modern Foreign Languages  $6\frac{1}{4}\%$   
Numerical gain in enrollment ..... 4,085  
Numerical gain in Latin ..... 2,067  
Numerical gain in Modern Foreign Languages ..... 566  
Majority in Latin over Modern Foreign Languages 1,016 (compare with Cincinnati, below)

The loss in Modern Foreign Languages, so far as the figures indicate, is in French, with some small gain in Spanish. Probably, if numbers taking Modern Foreign Languages in Technical Schools were included, there would be a few more in all Modern Foreign Languages than in Latin (see above). However, it is evident that there are many more studying Latin than Modern Foreign Languages in the High Schools of the State.

#### CINCINNATI

Since Cincinnati is the largest city to make one hundred per cent returns, it seems worth while to tabulate separately the figures for that city. Returns from Canton and Dayton are likewise complete.

	Total Enrollment	No. in Latin	No. in Modern Foreign Languages
1921-1922	7,967	2,759	3,653
1920-1921	7,072	2,161	3,291
Gain	895	598	362
Percent of gain	12.6	27.6	11

#### LATIN AND MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES IN OHIO OUTSIDE OF THE LARGER CITIES

This report is based on returns from 150 Schools in the

that more Latin teachers are needed than for all modern foreign languages. . . . The Bulletin of Indiana University gives the increase in number of Latin teachers employed in the State as 40% in four years, and the calls for last year were fully three times as many as the University had candidates. The Bulletin of the University of Iowa reports candidates for only 18%—less than one-fifth—of the calls received. . . . The more promising pupils in second year Latin should be definitely encouraged to go on. Those who are planning to go to College or a University should be informed of the situation, and even those who are leaving the High School with only one or two years of Latin should be told that almost every College has a course in Latin which they need". C. K.

twenty-four counties regularly covered by Latin News and Notes of Ohio University. Since we have the returns from a large part of these for three years, it is now possible to increase the value of the report by covering that period. Many details given last year are not repeated.

Gain in total enrollment, 1921-1922, over 1919-1920	23.3%
Gain in Latin enrollment, 1921-1922, over 1919-1920	26.7%
<i>Net gain</i>	3.4%
Gain in Modern Foreign Languages, 1921-1922, over 1919-1920	16.9%
<i>Net loss</i>	6.4%
Number reported in total enrollment 1921-1922	18,231
Number reported studying Latin 1921-1922	7,093
Number reported studying Modern Foreign Languages 1921-1922	3,043

Because of the very rapid growth of the High Schools it has been said frequently that many who now enter High School naturally would not and should not be expected to study Latin. In the light of this, for the percentage gain in Latin to exceed the corresponding gain in the total enrollment is all the more significant.

The gain reported last year is bearing extended fruit, for with a gross gain of  $16\frac{1}{2}\%$  in Latin this year there is a gain of 20% in Second Year Latin. It is to be hoped that this will bear further fruit next year in the number who will study Third and Fourth Year Latin. Unfortunately, the reports show a slight falling off in these courses this year. The loss in Modern Foreign Languages is less this year than last, as was to be expected, since we are farther from the reversion of feeling which followed the World War. That this loss is vitally related to the increase in Latin seems extremely doubtful.

#### LATIN OUTSIDE OF OHIO

Reports that have come from a number of individual Schools outside of Ohio reaching from New York City to places South and West indicate very encouraging gains in Latin. Some more definite reports are as follows:

*Nebraska*.—A very decided increase is reported in the total enrollment in Latin in Nebraska. There is an increase in the Third and Fourth years from 1919-1920 to 1920-1921, but with some dropping off in these courses this year. This is similar to the situation in Ohio, and is based on practically complete reports.

*Iowa*.—Reports from 294 High Schools in Iowa show 11,546 pupils in Latin, and 4,938 pupils in Modern Foreign Languages. There is an increase in Spanish, which is overcome by a loss in French, so as to make an actual loss in Modern Foreign Languages. Latin shows a gain, although not as great as in Ohio and Nebraska.

*New York*.—Of 609 rural High Schools in New York State 95% give one year of Latin, 92% give two years of Latin, and 56% give three years of Latin. 75% give one year of French, and 69% give two years of French. 10% give one year of Spanish, and 8% give two years of Spanish. This shows how strong Latin is in the New York rural Schools.

## REVIEWS

*A History of Rome.* By Tenney Frank. New York: Henry Holt and Company (1923). Pp. ix + 613. Library Edition, \$4.50; Educational Edition, \$3.50.

The author of this sketch is one of our most prominent teachers of Latin. He has not been obsessed with the idea that the chief purpose of Latin studies is syntax and text exegesis, nor has he been absorbed with the 'practical' value of his subject. His wider and more urbane interests have long been attested by his illuminating articles in American and foreign journals, and particularly by his historical books—*Roman Imperialism* (1914), and *The Economic History of Rome to the End of the Republic* (1920), the latter of which is a fine and stimulating study which deserves to be ranked among the best American contributions to the economic conditions of any age or nation (for a review, by Professor Boak, of this work, see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14. 61–63). His more literary interests are evidenced by his excellent book, *Vergil, A Biography* (1922).

It is curious that until only two years ago no American had written a text-book of Roman history suitable for College use. We have, therefore, been served either by elementary and general histories by American writers or by more advanced ones by English historians. However well these latter may be written, they certainly have not fully met our requirements. But now we have two such American works—*A History of Rome to 565 A. D.*, by Professor A. E. R. Boak (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 16.189–191), and the book now under discussion. The former, though it is carefully written and rigidly scientific, is too condensed, too exclusively political and military in its scope, and withal too matter-of-fact in its presentation to serve as a text-book for College classes which devote a year to the study of the subject. Dr. Frank's book is quite as modern in its view-point, quite as authoritative, and certainly more compelling in its human interest, even if it appears to have been somewhat hurriedly composed and if its strongly economic bias might lead one to suspect that it is in a sense a by-product of his earlier studies. The enthusiastic reception which the book is sure to receive from College teachers will, perhaps, render pardonable a somewhat lengthy and detailed review for readers of *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*.

The style of the work is uniformly clear and attractive and carries the story rapidly along, even though it is seldom relieved either by figurative language or by striking powers of description. Such a fine bit of writing, for example, as the following is rare (501):

...Imperial Rome might have been a 'melting-pot' of the races, but the crude ores that went into it were largely low grade, and the fire beneath the pot too feeble to extract any precious metal. The gold was lost in the slag.

One misses eloquent accounts of stirring events. Take, for instance, the prosaic description, in Chapter VII (115–135), of the Hannibalic War, the story of which is, perhaps, the most inspiring episode in Roman

history. But here is little of Livy's power of vivid description, little of the resourcefulness and genius of the world's greatest strategist, and little of the tremendous importance of that struggle which a recent writer has justly called "the most terrible war that ever has been, not excepting the recent war in Europe" (Arnold Toynbee, in R. W. Livingstone, *The Legacy of Greece*, 314). The horror of it haunted later generations, and, a hundred and fifty years after Hannibal had left Italy, inspired one of the grandest passages of Lucretius (3.830–842). Again, the brief description of the siege and destruction of Carthage at the end of the Third Punic War (160–161) is similarly tame. Here the author has lost a fine opportunity to disclose Roman duplicity and greed, which should have led him to a different conception of the development of Roman imperialism. But the work is full of allusions to Latin literature, and many of the appreciations of Roman writers are masterly, e. g. of Catullus (324–325) and Tacitus (502–503). And the character sketches are generally fine, e. g. of Cato (152–153), Gaius Gracchus (200–201), Marius (215–216, 233, 235), the Greeks and the Romans (164–165), although others are inadequate, e. g. of Sertorius (248–249), Mithradates (236–237), Titus (454), and especially Diocletian (553) and Constantine (561–562).

The book outlines the story of Rome from prehistoric times to the overthrow of the West in 476, though it practically ends with the death of Constantine in 337, following which there is a chapter on The Causes of Rome's Decline (565–574), and a very brief Epilogue (575–585). The contents are unequally divided between the Republic and the Empire, 334 out of the total of 585 pages of text bringing the account to the death of Caesar. The proportions are not altogether satisfactory. While, for example, the account of the Ciceronian period is avowedly full and detailed, that of the later Empire is exceedingly brief where it is not altogether ignored. Ten pages only are devoted to the Fifty Years of Anarchy from the accession of Maximin to that of Diocletian (Chapter XXIX, 543–552). The year of six emperors, 238 A. D., is hardly mentioned. Twelve pages are given to Autocracy, Diocletian, and Constantine (Chapter XXX, 553–564). The discussion of Diocletian and Constantine, therefore, is very brief and unsatisfactory. Less than three pages carry on the story from the death of Constantine to that of Theodosius in 395 A. D., and less than five more bring the reader to the accession of Odoacer in 476. With such rigid condensation the Emperor Julian receives only one-third of a page (575).

While the book constantly keeps in mind the needs of College teachers, it is, as we read in the Preface, "intended primarily for general readers". For these, as well as for teachers, an excellent eight-page bibliography of modern works in English, German, French, and Italian is added (591–598), readings from which are apportioned to the various chapters. This is preceded by a four-page summary of the ancient sources. Apart from eleven maps and plans, only four of which are in colors, there is no illustrative material. The Index is

hardly comprehensive enough. The entire work is practically free from typographical errors.

Every important phase of Roman history has been treated in this compact sketch. Six of the thirty-two chapters are wholly devoted to cultural aspects—political, social, and economic conditions, government and law, education and philosophy, religion and morality, literature and art—, while several others are in part given over to such topics, especially to literature. In addition, Chapter XI (180-193) is a remarkably succinct and lucid account of the Roman Constitution, and Chapter XXI (375-405), on Business Life, is easily the most entertaining of all. Chapter headings are not always informing, and the spare use of dates in the subdivisions of the text is regrettable.

Despite the fact that much is said of the interrelationship of Greeks and Romans, nowhere do we find a definite exposition of the essential unity of the Greek and Roman world. Yet the political action is continuous from the emergence of the Greek City-State from the Aegean background down to the end of the municipal government in the Empire. At some point in this development, say sometime in the second century B. C., the story of the Greeks reaches a stage where it is convenient to treat it under the story of Rome. The Empire was essentially a Greek institution, for it was a federation of City-States and the solution of the problem which had faced the Greek States ever since the Persian wars. Even the centralized bureaucracy was formed primarily to hold the municipalities together. Or one might say that the Empire during the first two centuries at least was a compromise between the old City-State and autocracy, whatever it was thereafter. In the cultural story there is one literature, Greek, most of the branches of which were carried on by the Latin writers. Moreover, while the Western provinces were always thinly populated and thinly veneered by Roman influence, the Eastern had been Hellenized since the time of Alexander. And the industrial and mercantile centers of the Empire were mostly Greek.

Professor Frank has somewhat modified the view expressed in his *Roman Imperialism* of the significance of the old *ius fetiale*—theregulation which discountenanced wars of aggression (86). This he now views as little more than a religious rite, at best having a salutary effect, since the Senate could always find a plausible excuse for attack, "if it really wanted one". We may feel certain that early Roman diplomacy was not guided by any such lofty principle of ethics, as we know it was not, for example, in 264 B. C., when, at the invitation of the Mamertines, Appius Claudius was sent to occupy Messana and so precipitated the First Punic War. At its end Rome's treatment of Sicily leads the author to remark that "Outside of Italy Rome now became an imperial democracy. . ." (101), an epoch-making date in the history of Rome, for it was "the beginning of her surrender to un-Roman ideas and Oriental policies of government".

But Dr. Frank has not materially changed his view of the origin of imperialism in Republican Rome, for he

still believes (Chapter VIII), that Rome's policy in her conquests of the second century B. C. was antiimperialistic. Thus he thinks that the Senate hesitated to accept Ptolemy's request for aid against Philip and Antiochus because it was reluctant to abandon the tradition against aggressive wars, and so he argues that the Second Punic War (200-196 B. C.) was merely the result of the Philhellenic policy of Scipio to help Athens and Rhodes. Yet at the end of that war, even though Flamininus declared the Greek States and Leagues free, their boundaries were defined by a treaty guaranteed by the Senate. Again, in the war with Antiochus (192-190 B. C.), he believes that the Senate was only interested in the freedom of the Greeks and remarks that there is "no indication that Rome had as yet assumed that it would ever be necessary for her to extend her power definitely beyond the Adriatic Sea" (146). Still a war indemnity was paid to Rome at the end of that war. Only in the twenty years after Magnesia does he note a change in Rome's Eastern policy. Cato, who in his view was no imperialist and did not want to expand Rome's empire any more than Scipio did, opposed the Philhellenes merely because he believed that Rome should no longer expend blood and treasure for sentiment alone. But, when Rome again withdrew from the East after Pydna, it was clearly understood that the Greek States had lost their independence. This "anti-imperialistic" policy of Rome compelled Rhodes, Pergamum, and the Achaean League to give her hostages and to become *socii*, and by 146 B. C. Corinth—as well as Carthage—was destroyed. To Dr. Frank none of these movements is commercial, although it is difficult to explain such wholesale meddling on the part of Rome, unless her policy was directed by a definite imperialistic principle. To him commerce became a determining factor in Rome's foreign relations for the first time in the next century. He finds "perhaps the first clear instance" in Roman history of business interests favoring expansion in the time of Pompey, when the latter, against the will of the Senate, but with the favor of the populace and the capitalists, was given full power for an indefinite period in the war against Mithradates, since it was believed he would open new provinces and re-introduce the old contract system of tax-gathering which had been so satisfactory to the Knights in the days of Gaius Gracchus (255-256).

The generally conservative spirit of the author is shown by many of the views expressed; e. g. that Rome, originally Latin in origin, was taken over by the Etruscan adventurers about 600 B. C. (19-21); that the legends of the kings as recounted by Livy indicate the general course of events in the regal period; by the acceptance of the account given by Polybius (3.22) of the Carthaginian treaty of 509 B. C. (rejected by E. Taubler, *Imperium Romanum*, I), and of the account of Dionysius Halicarnassus (7.95) of the Latin treaty of 493 B. C. (35-36), by the acceptance of the Licinio-Sextian reforms of 367 B. C. (46-47), and the disputed First Samnite War of 343-341 B. C. (60-61), both of which are omitted from Professor Boak's book.

Even the tradition that Rome was so ignorant of ships in the First Punic War that she modeled her fleet after a wrecked Carthaginian quinquereme is accepted, though it seems clear that the Romans were long familiar with war-ships by that date, *circa* 260 B. C., and could have used those of their Sicilian and Italian allies. The boastful inscription on the Column of Duilius, set up in honor of the victory at Mylae in that year, which states that he was "the first consul to fight with ships on the sea and to build a war-fleet" (99), does not exclude such an explanation.

Dr. Frank's view that Carthage, even if she had won the First Punic War, would not have become a world power, and that the Italians would not have endured a generation of her Oriental rule (107), seems reasonable. But the doubt expressed whether Hannibal had any intention or hope of crushing Rome and turning Italy into a tribute-paying State, a theory based on the treaty between Hannibal and Philip V in 215 B. C. (Polybius, 7.1), which contemplated a strong Rome after that war, is not conclusive, since we have no idea how sincere Hannibal was in his efforts to win Philip's favor. It does not follow, therefore, that the Hannibalic War was merely one "of revenge, of recovery, and of winning . . . commercial privileges" (114). Nor can we whole-heartedly follow Dr. Frank in placing the blame of that war entirely on Carthaginian expansion in Spain and its effect on the commerce of Rome's ally Massilia (109-110). Even if Hannibal's attack on Saguntum was the occasion, the Roman conquest of Cisalpine Gaul must be taken into account in assessing the responsibility for that war (see Ferrero-Barbagallo, *A Short History of Rome*, I, 160-162).

The battle of Pydna, discussed on page 156, is not named in the text, but the name is found in the Index. Perhaps the epitaph on Sulla's grave "breathes the true spirit of the petty politician" (245), but it does far more—it breathes the spirit of the whole conception of Graeco-Roman ethics. The account of Caesar's conquest of Gaul (280 f.) is excellent, but its importance for Rome and the modern world is not appraised (see C. Julian, *De la Gaule à la France. Nos Origines Historiques*, 1922). It is a question which has long exercised Greek historians whether Alexander deliberately spread the story of his descent from Zeus Ammon for practical purposes (309), whatever Caesar may have done. For the true relationship of Antony and Cleopatra (346) and for the marriage of Messalina and Silius (429), one must turn to Ferrero, *Characters and Events of Roman History*, 37 f., and *The Women of the Caesars*, 264 f., respectively. The idea that Augustus was sincere in his offer to the Senate on January 13, 27 B. C., to restore the Republic and surrender all powers not consonant with the office of a Republican consul is certainly as good as the opposing view (347-349). Similarly, the acceptance of Mommsen's view of the Dyarchy of 23 B. C. is reasonable enough.

The *quinquennium* of Nero, even if vouched for by Hadrian (431), might better be regarded as merely a cloak for the Emperor's real intentions. The point of

the story of Vespasian's tainted money, fully told by Suetonius, is partly missed (449). There is little object in repeating the tradition that Vespasian died standing (454), or that Constantine was born out of wedlock (561). The remains of Trajan's bridge over the Danube at the "Iron Gate" are mentioned (477), but nothing is said of the magnificent remains of his well-hewn road, which may be seen extending for miles along the Serbian bank of the river. On page 495 it is said that the executive power was divided formally for the first time between two Augusti with Lucius Verus (161-169 A. D.) and Marcus Aurelius (161-180 A. D.). However, on page 455 it is rightly stated that Titus was associated with his father from 71 A. D., Vespasian procuring for his son from the Senate both the tribunician and the proconsular power. It is an exaggeration to say that the fine reliefs on the Arch of Titus are "the best plastic representation of bodies in vigorous movement that ancient art has yielded" (471). The story of the sale of the Empire to Julianus in 193 A. D. might have been recounted. Bryce is quoted (518) to the effect that Southern Europe enjoyed better order under Hadrian and the Antonines than again "to nearly our own time". The same sentiment might have been quoted more appropriately from the two greatest modern historians of Rome—Gibbon and Mommsen. Dr. Frank is hardly fair to Elagabalus (538-539), if the researches of John Stuart Hay (*The Amazing Emperor Heliogabalus*, 1911) are to be relied upon. He accepts the story that Constantine thought he saw the cross in the sky before the battle of the Milvian Bridge (562), though it was long ago rejected by Gibbon. The name of Constantine's mother, Helena, can scarcely be called Oriental (561).

In Chapter XXXI Professor Frank discusses The Causes of Rome's Decline, remarking that we must admit that "a definite and adequate answer will never be attainable" (565). Among the chief causes he names three—the rapid expansion of Rome, the existence of slavery on a vast scale, and, as a consequence of these, the displacement of Romans by non-Romans. His attempt to gauge aright the economic factor seems inadequate to one who has read W. L. Westermann's article, *The Economic Basis of the Decline of Ancient Culture* (*American Historical Review* 20 [1915], 723-743). One may also feel that in this chapter (463 f.), and elsewhere in the book (e. g. 179, 242-243), too much emphasis is laid on the racial changes and the gradual uprooting of the Roman and Italian peoples who were constantly being "replaced by newer stocks from below", i. e. slaves. That the decay in imaginative literature which set in during the first century was in part, at least, due to this cause (463) may be granted; but that the race which built the Republic was destroyed by peoples temperamentally incapable of Republican government (243) is not so clear in face of similar conditions in America. Dr. Frank might have followed more closely his own words: "We know as yet so little about race and racial inheritance that extreme caution is necessary in attempting to estimate this factor" (566). The few lines de-

voted to the part played by Christianity in the general ruin of Rome should have been influenced by Ferrero's last work, *The Ruin of the Ancient Civilization and the Triumph of Christianity* (1921).

Despite certain differences of opinion in historical judgments, it should be added that few critics will question the present reviewer's belief that Professor Frank's book is the best College text-book of Roman history in our language.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

WALTER WOODBURN HYDE

*Epilogomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* By Jane Ellen Harrison. Cambridge: at the University Press (1921). Pp. 40.

Miss Harrison's pamphlet, *Epilogomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, is a sequel to her two monumental books, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*<sup>2</sup> (1908), and *Themis* (1912). As the book entitled *Themis* was influenced by Bergson and by Durkheim, who first emphasized the social origin of religion, which can therefore be properly studied only in relation to social structure, so the present work is dominated by the newer psychology of Jung and Freud, and by the Russian philosopher Soloviov.

Chapter I deals with Primitive Ritual (1-26). The one end of religion, says Miss Harrison, is to conserve and promote life. This can be done by positive means or by driving away evil influences. Much that seems positive or "impulsive" is in its origin "expulsion", for religion in its progress tends to eliminate the negative and emphasize the positive at its expense (2).

Miss Harrison states that the object of her discussion is to show the constantly shifting nature of the notion of religion. As a function of our human nature, religion grows and shifts with human growth (5). There was a time it presupposed no god. The discussion of Totem, Tabu, and Exogamy (7-14) is a sordid picture of a primitive family, with a truly Freudian emphasis on the sexual aspect. Father and son are competing for the females of the family. The father's solution is to drive away the young males and exogamy is the result (8). The beginning of all our morality appears when certain females are tabooed by the father for his exclusive use (9). The totem is a group badge adopted to mark exclusion and to facilitate taboos; to it is felt a mingling of attraction and repulsion, the "Ambivalenz" of Freud (10). The idea of immortality arises through ancestor-cult from the commemoration of ancestors (13).

The initiation ceremony (14-18) is a fertility rite, the chief *rite de passage*, and represents, when it does not actually cause, the death of the initiate (15). It focuses on sex, as totem-rites focus on nutrition (17). The god developed from the human king, via the year-drama or fertility-play. The most momentous step, for better or for worse, that the religious imagination has ever taken was the notion that the divine was human-shaped (22).

Miss Harrison's second chapter, Primitive Theology (27-34), is of great interest. No running comment on it would be of much avail. It is brief and full of meat and should be read entire. The influence of Freud is apparent. To Miss Harrison theology is not a necessity of religion. Its origin is due to a momentary halt between perception and reaction. It springs from arrested, unsatisfied desire. We create for ourselves an image of what we want and that image is our god. It is part of ourselves, and becomes separated from us only by personification, assisted by "the existence of a leader to a band of worshippers", and by "the making of puppets or images", which anyone can see are exterior to himself (28). A magical rite may decline and become obsolete because of repeated failure, but the demon that has been projected from that rite does not pass away, but develops into a god (30). Miss Harrison seems to stress overmuch the Greek feeling of a gulf between god and man. Few civilized nations have felt it so little. Man yearns, she says, for communion with the god from which he has been separated. This reunion is the goal of all the mysteries (31). Primitive theology and mythology spring, not from "directed thinking", but from "dream or phantasy thinking", which turns man away from reality and utters unfulfilled desire (32). Myth is, then, a fragment of the soul-life. A kindly light is thus shed on theology, so much abused and depreciated in our day. Its biological function is to prevent the dangerous subliminal "suppressed complex" by inducing man to turn over his conflict to the gods and cast all his care on them. The more segregated from man, the more "Olympian" a god is, the better he serves as a safety-valve (33). God thus becomes in literal truth the desire of nations, and religion becomes an intelligent concern for all the values that minister to "species continuity" (34).

The third chapter, The Religion of To-day (35-40), is a plea for asceticism—"via crucis, via lucis" (40). Primitive religion aimed at the conservation of life; modern religion aims at the betterment of life by the exercise of the function of choice and the practice of asceticism (36). This latter is the core and the essence of religion. It is no longer imposed by the group in the interest of the group, but by the individual in the interest of his own spiritual life. To the Russians, as their idiom reveals, and preeminently to Soloviov, shame is the sign-manual of human consciousness. Man is ashamed of certain things, not because they are wrong, for they are not, but because they pertain to his animal body (37). This is not to say that his animal body is not good, but he has something higher, and the better, being the enemy of the good, is ashamed of it (38). By thus setting the good body in opposition to the better soul, the former is made bad and we see the basic Manichaeism of the whole system, steeped, as it is, in Oriental pessimism.

Shame issues in asceticism, the setting "out of the soul toward the higher value. It is not, therefore, negative, but vital and creative, not the mortification of the flesh, but the attuning of an instrument (39), not a

thing that is cold and dead, but "an awful warmth around the heart" (40).

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT

The Cults of Cisalpine Gaul as Seen in the Inscriptions. By Joseph Clyde Murley. Menasha, Wisconsin: The Collegiate Press (1922). Pp. viii + 112.

This University of Chicago dissertation aims to set forth the inscriptional evidence for the pagan cults of Cisalpine Gaul. The deities are arranged in seven classes, as follows: Roman (1-38), Italic (39-49), Greek (50-64), Deified Abstractions (65-69), Divi (70-71), Oriental (72-80), and Celtic (81-93). For the Divi the evidence consists almost entirely of titles of individuals, e. g. Flamen Divi Iuli (70). In the treatment of the Deified Abstractions, the numerous dedications to Victory are listed under the State cults of the Republic (65). Of course there are many instances of this cult under the Empire. Except in these two chapters, the deities are arranged by local origin. Of 200 inscriptions to Iuppiter 117, (142, if we count cases where an additional title is used) are directed to Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (15). Mars receives surprisingly few dedications (16). There are interesting discussions of dedications to the genius of a person, and to the Vires, the attendants of Silvanus (31). The chief Italic deities are Diana, Minerva, Fortuna, Aquae Aponi, Venus, Libitina, and Priapus. In one instance, where Diana is found in connection with Apollo, it would seem better to classify her as a Greek deity (41). Under Greek gods are listed the Fatae ("Fatabus": 50-51), Hercules (very frequent), Castor (or the Castores), Apollo, Ceres (once as a Lar Publicus: 56), Liber, Mercury, Aesculapius and Hygieia, Dis and Proserpina, Aerecura (*Hpa Kypa*) Luna, and references in a few miscellaneous, isolated inscriptions, e. g. one to Zeus Thales (62). Chapter VI is devoted to Oriental gods, who appear often under Latin names, e. g. Mater Deum, Iuppiter Optimus Maximus (Aeternus, Dolichenus, especially in maritime districts, a fact which points to dissemination by merchants: 75), Isis, Mithras, and especially Cautipates and Cautes, two aspects of Mithras, which achieved some individuality and came to be conceived as his attendants (79). The Celtic gods also are sometimes masked under Roman titles, e. g. Iuppiter Optimus Ambisagrus (*custos*), Agganaicus, Adceneicus, Felvennis, etc., but, far more frequently, Iuppiter Optimus Maximus Poeninus, uniformly found in the Pennine Alps (83). The Matronae are very prominent (86); the Iunones,

to whom many inscriptions are addressed, are practically identical with them (88). Of 34 known inscriptions to Belenus, 30 appear in Cisalpine Gaul. The god is apparently parallel with Apollo (89). Several dedications are found to Bergimus, probably a mountain spirit of the region around Brixia (90).

Chapter VIII discusses Syncretistic Tendencies (94-95). Many inscriptions bear the name of no god, but merely mention *di omnes*, *di deae immortales*, etc. Pantheus appears as cognomen of Iuppiter, Liber, Priapus, Silvanus, Serapis, but also independently as a sort of epitome of the qualities or personalities of all the gods. In the type of inscription that lacks the name, only the germ of syncretism is present: the basic reason for its use is usually the fear of giving offence by omitting some deity. But in Pantheus a long step is taken in the direction of monotheism.

Chapter IX, on Dedicants and their Social Groups (96-106), is one of the most interesting. Dr. Murley distinguishes two sets of groups, not mutually exclusive, as follows: 1 a, men; 1 b, women (1 a numbers six and a half times 1 b), 2 a, free persons, 2 b, freed persons, 2 c, slaves. 2 a, 2 b, and 2 c appear in the proportion 3:2:1 (97). The Roman gods, since this group includes Iuppiter, are the most popular with all classes of dedicants, receiving about one-third of all the dedications. Vesta and the Lares and the Penates are addressed by men only, for the inscriptions to the Lares partake of an official character (97). Silvanus is surpassed in the number of dedications only by Iuppiter, Mercury, and Hercules. All classes, of course, worship the Di Manes (99). The Italic gods, including, as they do, Diana, Feronia, Minerva, and Venus, have a larger ratio of representation of women than of men (99). Among all classes, except among women, the Greek gods stand second. In all, the Oriental gods stand fifth, the Celtic gods third.

Some of Dr. Murley's conclusions, e. g. that women tend to ignore the deified abstractions (105), are dubious, in view of the small number of instances attested. Somewhat clearer is the thorough-going orthodoxy of the slaves, who slight Oriental and Celtic cults, which all other classes of dedicants honor.

The twelve great gods of Cisalpine Gaul, in the order of their importance, were Iuppiter, Mercury, Hercules, Silvanus, Matronae, Minerva, Mithras, Genius, Diana, Isis, Belenus, and Poeninus (106).

The dissertation is, in general, well written and the bibliography is adequate.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY JOSEPH WILLIAM HEWITT